

University of Pittsburgh
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
PIA 2021: International Affairs
Fall 2018

Professor Luke Condra

Class sessions:

Wednesdays, 9:00 - 11:50 am
Posvar 3911

Contact information:

Email: lcondra@pitt.edu
Telephone: (412) 648-8088

Office hours:

Tuesday, 10 AM - 12 PM, and by appointment
Office: Posvar 3810
Sign-up: <http://www.wejoinin.com/sheets/otstx>

Course Description

This is an introductory course in the field of international affairs (IA). It is designed to give students knowledge of the major theoretical approaches and issues in international politics and introduce students to topics of interest within the three majors of IA: Security and Intelligence Studies, International Political Economy, and Human Security. Unlike the authority structures that characterize domestic political settings, international politics lacks the formal institutions with authority and ability to enforce agreements. Anarchy, the central feature of the international system, gives rise to serious problems in international affairs, including domestic and international violence, nuclear proliferation, trade inefficiencies, and financial crisis. The degree to which governments and institutions can solve these problems in spite of anarchy is one of the most important and interesting topics of study for scholars and practitioners of international politics.

Course Objectives

Students who engage with the course should be able to do the following upon successful course completion:

- Speak knowledgeably about the main topics and questions that concern social scientists and policy makers who work in the arena of international politics.
- Evaluate arguments about those questions according to logical and evidentiary standards. Students will practice thinking like social scientists, scrutinizing the internal logic of theories and testing them rigorously using quantitative and qualitative data.
- Comfortably engage in philosophical as well as scientific analysis. People often disagree about what is morally right and wrong in international affairs. Students will join these ethical debates through class discussion and written assignments.
- Write clear and persuasive arguments.
- Read analytically.

- Present evidence in a compelling way through verbal presentations with visual (i.e. power-point) support.

Course Assignments

Each student's final course grade will be comprised of the following assignments and weighted as follows:

1. In-class professionalism and contribution (5% total).

All students are expected to attend class, be thoroughly prepared to discuss the week's readings, and to engage in respectful discussion with their classmates' ideas and perspectives. During class meetings, students should demonstrate having thoroughly read and reflected upon the readings. Most class sessions will open with an interactive dialogue of that week's readings in the form of student presentations followed by a mixture of lecture and small-group discussion and activities. Throughout each session, students will be expected to identify the key points of the readings, the points of interest to them, etc. Attendance and contribution are graded each week. Consistent, excellent participation and contribution may result in a total contribution grade greater than 5%.

2. Policy memos (x2); 15% each, 30% total.

Each student will write two individual memos that tackle a current policy issue or problem related to the week's readings. The goal of the memo is for students to propose a tentative solution related to a real-world problem/issue of their choice that bears directly on the theme for that week. The student should research the problem/issue sufficiently beforehand such that they are able to clearly articulate what the essential facts are and what's at stake. The student should then use the theoretical and empirical content from that week's readings to support their proposed solution *and* to address relevant counter-proposals and arguments. Each memo should carefully follow the guidelines outlined below:

a. *Executive summary (150-200 words)*. The executive summary provides the reader with a synopsis of your policy memo. Ideally, the recipient of your memo should be able to read the executive summary and come away with a good sense of what issue you're tackling and what your proposed solution is. The executive summary should have the following components: (a) A clear statement of the policy problem/issue you are addressing; (b) What solution you are proposing to address the problem/issue under consideration; (c) What kinds of theoretical and empirical evidence support your position; and (d) Why your proposal is better than the alternatives. The executive summary should be a minimum of 150 words and should not exceed 200 words.

b. *Background (200-250 words)*. In this section, you should clearly specify what problem or issue you are addressing and provide the reader with the relevant context. You should reference at least one *news report* from a high-quality newspaper or magazine and provide a (brief) background summary of the selected real-world event.¹ Your background summary may include answers to one

¹ This should be reporting of an event; it should *not* be an editorial or opinion. News reports vary in quality based upon the rigor of fact-checking and objectivity. Examples of high-quality sources include: *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *The Guardian (UK)*, *China Daily (China)*, *The Times of India*, *The Financial Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*. You may also use news reports from *The Economist*. You will submit this article along with your memo. Part of your grade is based upon selecting a high-quality article.

or more of the following questions:

- What is notable about the situation (i.e. why is this story “news”)?
- What conflict exists, and why?
- Who are the main actors, what is each actor's interest, and what actions are being taken to achieve an actor's interest?
- Do governance structures (domestic or international) support or constrain each actor's ability to achieve his preferred outcome?

3. *Analysis (700-800 words)*. This section constitutes the core of your policy memo. In it, you should clearly lay out what it is you're proposing that policymakers ought to do about the problem or issue you're addressing (e.g., stick with the status quo versus taking some action) and identify what the relevant alternatives or counter-arguments are and why they're inferior to what you're proposing. The best memos will use the content of the readings as vehicles to make particular points. Going too far in either direction (i.e. a literature review on one end or a policy proposal devoid of any reference to the readings on the other) will detract from the overall grade.

4. *Conclusion (150-200 words)*. Finally, at a high level, what should a reader conclude from the preceding discussion? How feasible is your proposed solution? Will it require lots of resources to properly execute? How likely is it to succeed?

e. Please include bibliography at the end of your memo. There are no word limits for this section.

Some tips on execution and a caveat:

- *Professional, polished presentation*. The best memos will follow the assigned guidelines and read like final versions of an important briefing to the most senior boss in one's department, agency, organization, etc. A polished, professional memo has flawless grammar and spelling and is thoughtfully formatted for the ease of the memo's reader.
- *Clear communication of ideas*. The best memos are those that clearly and simply express ideas to the memo's reader. Someone reading the memo who is intelligent but uninformed about the specific topic should be able to quickly and easily understand the memo's explanations and point of view. Make use of headings, subheadings, and bullet points to enhance the readability of your memo.
- **This is not meant to perfectly mimic what you will do in your next job. It is meant to give you practice writing in the general style of a policy memo or brief.*

During our second in-class meeting, you will be assigned two memo dates, one between weeks 3 and 8, and one between weeks 9 and 15.

For example, if a student is assigned to write a memo due week 3 (September 12):

-the memo is due on Wednesday, September 12 (week 3)

-the memo will discuss the required readings for week 3

Memos must be uploaded to CourseWeb before 9:00 AM on the due date. Late work will not be accepted.

3. Presentations (x2); 15% each, 30% total.

Students will work in groups to create and deliver a presentation on the topic listed on the syllabus. Each presentation is an application of the week's lecture topic. Presentations should last about 10 minutes in total. Afterward, students should be prepared to answer questions from the audience and instructor, which will test the strength of the argument.

Presentations should utilize the following tips:

1. Each group is required make an argument (with a clear thesis statement) related to that week's readings. It is your job to ensure that the audience understands the topic, what your primary argument is, and why your thesis is more compelling than alternatives. Select the appropriate amount of detail versus big-picture statements and examples. Use visuals to effectively make your point.
2. Practice, practice, practice! Practice to an empty room, to your pets, to each other. The presentation should be a coordinated, seamless whole – not a disjointed patchwork of individual snippets of information.
3. Delivery matters! Speak clearly and with confidence. You are working to engage with the audience. Do not use notecards.
4. Slide content should be simple. Text should be minimal and short. Do not use full sentences (unless you are presenting a quotation!)
5. Slides should have consistent format and spacing conventions.
6. Use a white background and black letters. Projectors often distort colors.

Presentations will be graded on the following criteria:

-Ideas and information

- *Clear thesis.* Is a clear argument / thesis presented?
- *Evidence.* How strong is the evidence to support that perspective?

-Slide preparation and delivery

- *Polished slides.* Are slides professional-level quality? Are they free of spelling errors, and do they use consistent format and spacing conventions?
- *Audience engagement - slide content.* Are slides well-organized, and does the substantive content (text and tables/figures/graphs) make it easy for the audience to quickly understand the topic and the presenters' perspectives on the topic?
- *Audience engagement - presentation delivery.* Does the presentation delivery enhance the content of the slides? Does the presentation exhibit extensive practice and polish?

In-class during week 2 (September 5), you will be assigned two group presentation dates, one between weeks 3 and 8, and one between weeks 9 and 15. You cannot write a memo and give a presentation in the same week.

By 9:00 AM on Tuesday, the day before the presentation is given, the group must send Professor Condra (via email) a 1-pg memo outlining the presentation and providing material that answers (at least) the following questions:

- What is your main argument?
- What are the key points from the course readings that are relevant and that you will cover?
- What is the evidence that supports your argument?

- How do you respond to anticipated counterarguments to your position?

Read and consult the following articles as you prepare your presentations.

- Jonathan A. Schwabish. “An economist’s guide to visualizing data.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 28(1): 209-234, 2014.
- Philip E. Bourne. “Ten simple rules for making good oral presentations.” *PLoS Computational Biology* 3(4): 593-594, 2007.

Presentation slides must be uploaded to CourseWeb no later than 8:00 AM on the presentation date.

4. In-class Final Exam (35%).

A final exam will be administered from 9:00-11:55 a.m. on Wednesday, December 12, and will cover material from the lectures, required readings, and in-class discussion. The format of the exam will be discussed ahead of time. Students should prepare for the exam cumulatively throughout the semester by staying current on the required readings and lecture content. Students are encouraged to collaborate and to pool reading summaries throughout the course of the semester.

Final Letter Grades

Your final grade will be assigned on the following scale:

A	=	94-100	B+	=	87-89	C+	=	77-79	D+	=	67-69
A-	=	90-93	B	=	83-86	C	=	73-76	D	=	65-66
			B-	=	80-82	C-	=	70-72	F	=	Below 65

Students receiving grades of “C+” or lower on early assignments are urged to meet with the instructor at the earliest opportunity to identify potential problems and develop strategies for improvement.

Cheating and plagiarism

All students are expected to adhere to the standards of academic honesty. Any student engaged in cheating, plagiarism, or other acts of academic dishonesty would be subject to disciplinary action. Any student suspected of violating this obligation for any reason during the semester will be required to participate in the procedural process, initiated at instructor level, as outlined in the University Guidelines on Academic Integrity:

http://www.provost.pitt.edu/sites/default/files/academic_integrity_guidelines.pdf. This may include, but is not limited to the confiscation of the examination of any individual suspected of violating the University Policy. Take the time to familiarize yourself with the rules of citation and with GSPIA's policy (found in Appendix A of the online GSPIA Handbook of Academic Policies and Procedures). If you have any questions on how to cite sources correctly, please ask the professor directly. Unless clearly specified (for instance, group presentations), you are expected to complete all assignments individually.

Disability Statement

If you have a disability for which you are or may be requesting and accommodation, you are encouraged to contact both your instructor and Disability Resources and Services (DRS), 140

William Pitt Union, (412) 648-7890, drsrecep@pitt.edu, (412) 228-5347 for P3 ASL users, as early as possible in the term. DRS will verify your disability and determine reasonable accommodations for this course.

Religious Observances

The University of Pittsburgh has a tradition of recognizing religious observances of members of the University community in instances where those observances may conflict with University activities. Examples of such occasions are Yom Kippur, Muharram, Diwali, and Good Friday, but other days of religious observance may also conflict with scheduled academic activities. When such conflict occurs, students and faculty should make a reasonable effort to reach mutually agreeable arrangements to reschedule the academic activity or provide a substitute activity or evaluation. Please make the instructor aware of any such conflicts as early in the term as possible so that we can make appropriate accommodations.

Readings

The amount of reading for each week is nontrivial, so if you fall behind, it is likely that you will remain behind for the rest of the semester. The articles and book chapters on the syllabus are chosen either because they are considered classic, because they develop useful analytical concepts or engage in important theoretical debates, or because they represent particularly good examples of social science research. Taken together, they constitute a useful introduction to some (but certainly not all) important topics in international politics. Each week in the course schedule lists required readings. There is no reader or specific books for the course. Instead, we draw upon articles and book chapters available for download on the course website or through the library's online databases.

Week 1: Course Introduction (8/29)

- Ethan Bueno de Mesquita, *Political Economy for Public Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), pp. 5-8. Available as an e-book from the Pitt library.
- Kenneth A. Shepsle, *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*, 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 2010), pp. 3-6.
- Thucydides, "The Melian Dialogue," in *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Book V. Available from: <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/melian.htm>

Week 2: Anarchy and Sovereignty (9/5)

- Strange, Susan, 1988. *State and Markets*. London: Pinter Publishers. Prologue: Some Desert Island Tales, pp. 1-6.
- John J. Mearsheimer. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Read chapter 2 (pp. 29-54).
- Helen Milner. 1991. "The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory: A Critique." *Review of International Studies* 17, i. 1: 67-85.
- Garrett Hardin. 1968. "Tragedy of the Commons." *Science* 162: 1243-1248.
- Elinor Ostrom. 1990. *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Read chapter 2 (pp. 29-57).

Week 3: Cooperation under Anarchy (9/12)

- Robert Jervis. 1978. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics* 30, no. 2: 167-214. Read pp. 167-186 carefully; skim pp. 186-214.
- Robert Axelrod and Robert O. Keohane. 1985. "Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions." *World Politics* 38: 226-254.
- Stephen D. Krasner. 1976. "State Power and the Structure of International Trade." *World Politics* 28, i. 3: 317-347.
- David H. Bearce, Katharine M. Floros, and Heather Elko McKibben. 2009. "The Shadow of the Future and International Bargaining: The Occurrence of Bargaining in a Three-Phase Cooperation Framework." *Journal of Politics* 71, i. 2: 719-732.

Week 4: Rationalist Theories of International Organizations and Compliance (9/19)

- Robert O. Keohane. 1984. *After Hegemony*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 1.
- Kenneth W. Abbott and Duncan Snidal. 1998. "Why States Act through Formal International Organizations." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42, i. 1: 3-32.
- Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink. 1999. "Transnational Advocacy Networks in International and Regional Politics." *International Social Science Journal* 51, i. 159: 89-101.
- Hyeran Jo and Beth A. Simmons. 2016. "Can the International Criminal Court Deter Atrocity?" *International Organization* 70, i. 3: 443-475.

Week 5: Critiques and Non-Rationalist Theories of International Organizations and Compliance (9/26)

- Abram Chayes and Antonia Handler Chayes. 1993. "On Compliance." *International Organization* 47, no. 2 (Spring): 175-205.
- Martha Finnemore and Michael Barnett. 1999. "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations." *International Organization* 53: 699-732.
- Alastair Iain Johnston. 2001. "Treating International Institutions as Social Environments." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, no. 4: 487-515.
- Beth A. Simmons and Judith Kelley. 2015. "Politics by Number: Indicators as Social Pressure in International Relations." *American Journal of Political Science* 59, i. 1.

Week 6: IPE - Trade (10/3)

- Judith Goldstein, Douglas Rivers, and Michael Tomz. 2007. "Institutions in International Relations: Understanding the Effects of the GATT and the WTO on World Trade." *International Organization* 61: 37-67.
- Joanne Gowa and Edward D. Mansfield. 1993. "Power Politics and International Trade." *American Political Science Review* 87, no. 2 (June): 408-20.
- Sungmin Rho and Michael Tomz. 2017. "Why Don't Trade Preferences Reflect Economic Self-Interest?" *International Organization* 71, i. S1: S85-S108.
- Megumi Naoi and Ikuo Kume. 2015. "Workers or Consumers? A Survey Experiment on the Duality of Citizens' Interests in the Politics of Trade" *Comparative Political Studies* 4(10):1293-1317.
- Paul Krugman. "In Praise of Cheap Labor." *Slate* (March 21, 1997). Available from: http://www.slate.com/articles/business/the_dismal_science/1997/03/in_praise_of_cheap_labor.html.

Week 7: IPE - Finance (10/10)

- Charles P. Kindleberger. *The World in Depression, 1929-1939*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1973. Chapter 14, "An Explanation of the 1929 Depression" (pp. 291-308).
- Stanley Fischer. 1999. "On the Need for an International Lender of Last Resort." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 13(4): 85-104.
- Axel Dreher. 2009. "IMF Conditionality: Theory and Evidence." *Public Choice* 141(1/2) 233-267.
- Allison Carnegie and Cyrus Samii. Forthcoming. "International Institutions and Political Liberalization: Evidence from the World Bank Loans Program." *British Journal of Political Science*.

Week 8: IPE - Economic Statecraft: Sanctions and Aid (10/17)

- David A. Baldwin. 1985. *Economic Statecraft*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 8, "Classic Cases' Reconsidered" (pp. 145-205).
- Daniel W. Drezner. 2011. "Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice." *International Studies Review* 13 i. 1: 96-108.
- Lisa L. Martin. 1993. "Credibility, Costs, and Institutions: Cooperation on Economic Sanctions." *World Politics* 45: 406-432.

- Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley. 2010. “The Domestic Political Economy of Foreign Aid: American Legislators and the Politics of Aid.” *Economics and Politics* 22 i. 2: 200-232.
- Ethan Bueno de Mesquita. 2016. *Political Economy for Public Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), pp. 318-25. Available as an e-book from the Pitt library.
- Paul Collier. *The Bottom Billion*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 7 (pp. 99-123). Available as an e-book from the Pitt library.

Week 9: SIS – Interstate War (10/24)

- Ethan Bueno de Mesquita. 2016. *Political Economy for Public Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), pp. 173-185. Available as an e-book from the Pitt library.
- Robert Jervis. 1988. “War and Misperception.” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18, no. 4 (Spring): 675-700.
- James D. Fearon. 1995. “Rationalist Explanations for War.” *International Organization* 49: 379-414.
- Robert Gilpin. 1981. *War and Change in World Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 4-5 (pp. 156-210).
- Michaela Mattes and Greg Vonnahme. 2010. “Contracting for Peace: Do Nonaggression Pacts Reduce Conflict?” *Journal of Politics* 72(4): 925–938.

Week 10: SIS – Nuclear War (10/31)

- Thomas C. Schelling. 2005. “An Astonishing Sixty Years: The Legacy of Hiroshima.” Nobel Prize Lecture. Available from: https://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/2005/schelling-lecture.pdf.
- Scott D. Sagan. 1996. “Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb.” *International Security* 21, no. 3 (Winter): 54-86.
- Scott D. Sagan and Kenneth N. Waltz. 2013. *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: An Enduring Debate*, 3rd ed. New York: W. W. Norton. Chapter 6, “Iraq, North Korea, and Iran” (pp. 175-214).
- Nina Tannenwald. 1999. “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use.” *International Organization* 53, no. 3: 433- 468.
- Daryl G. Press, Scott D. Sagan, and Benjamin A. Valentino. 2013. “Atomic Aversion: Experimental Evidence on Taboos, Traditions, and the Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons.” *American Political Science Review* 107, i. 1: 188-206.

Week 11: SIS –Terrorism (11/7)

- Walter Enders and Todd Sandler. 2012. *The Political Economy of Terrorism*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-2 (pp. 1-60). Available as an e-book from the Pitt library.
- Andrew Kydd and Barbara Walter. 2006. “The Strategies of Terrorism.” *International Security* 31, no. 1 (Summer): 49-79.
- Burcu Savun and Daniel Tirone. 2018. “Foreign Aid as a Counterterrorism Tool: More Liberty, Less Terror?” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62, no. 8: 1607-1635.
- Shana Kushner Gadarian. 2010. “The politics of threat: How terrorism news shapes foreign policy attitudes.” *Journal of Politics* 72(2): 469—483.

Week 12: HS – Civil War (11/14)

- Paul Collier. 2007. *The Bottom Billion*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 2 (pp. 17-37). Available as an e-book from the Pitt library.
- James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin. 2003. “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” *American Political Science Review* 97(1): 75-90.
- Lars-Erik Cederman, Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, and Halvard Buhaug. 2013. *Inequality, Grievances, and Civil War*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2-3 (pp. 11-56).
- Barbara Walter. 1997. “The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement.” *International Organization* 51: 335-64.
- Lise Morjé Howard and Alexandra Stark. February 2018. “Why Civil Wars Are Lasting Longer.” *Foreign Affairs*.

Week 13: HS – Refugees and Immigration (11/28)

- Khalid Koser. 2007. *International Migration: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 6, “Refugees and asylum-seekers.” Available as an e-book from the Pitt library.
- Prakash Adhikari. 2012. “The Plight of the Forgotten Ones: Civil War and Forced Migration.” *International Studies Quarterly* 56, i. 3: 590-606.
- Jens Hainmueller and Daniel J. Hopkins. 2015. “The Hidden American Immigration Consensus: A Conjoint Analysis of Attitudes toward Immigrants.” *American Journal of Political Science* 59, no. 3: 529-548.
- Sarah Blodgett Bermeo and David Leblang. 2015. “Migration and Foreign Aid.” *International Organization* 69(3): 627–657.

Week 14: HS – Peacekeeping (12/5)

- Gareth Evans and Mohammed Sahnoun. 2002. “The Responsibility to Protect.” *Foreign Affairs* (November/December): 99-110.
- Paul Collier. 2007. *The Bottom Billion*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 8 (pp. 124-34). Available as an e-book from the Pitt library.
- Virginia Page Fortna. 2004. “Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace after Civil War.” *International Studies Quarterly* 48, i. 2: 269-292.
- Samantha Power. 2002. *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. New York: Perennial. Chapter 10, “Rwanda: ‘Mostly in Listening Mode’” (pp. 329-389). Available as an e-book from the Pitt library.
- Lisa Hultman, Jacob Kathman, and Megan Shannon. 2014. “Beyond Keeping Peace: United Nations Effectiveness in the Midst of Fighting.” *American Political Science Review* 108: 737-753.

Week 15: Final Exam (12/12)